

REMARKS

Claims 22 - 28 are cancelled. Claims 29 - 30 are added. Claims 1 - 9, 11 - 21 are amended.

Claims 1 - 3, 6, 8 and 10 - 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Filo et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,215,498). Claim 1 has now been amended to distinguish itself from the Filo reference. Claim 1 has changed the term "pointing device" to "pointing object." Further, reference to a sensor has been deleted. Claim 1 also now includes the features in previous claim 2. Further, claim 1 now requires a method for detecting the position of the pointing object or its reflection or effect on the display in the image registered by the camera. This feature is not shown or disclosed in Filo. Further, the reflection or the effect on the display claimed in claim 1 covers a laser pointer shining on a projected screen. These features are not shown or disclosed in Filo. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable and dependent claims 2 - 10 are believed to be allowable also.

Claim 11 has been amended to distinguish from the prior art of Filo. Claim 11 now requires only a camera and references to the sensor have been deleted. Further, claim 11 defines characteristics for the pointing object that can be located in the image from the camera and at the same time distinguish it from the surrounding objects. Claim 11 further requires a method of detecting the last known position of the pointing object or its reflection or effect on the display in the image. These features are not shown or disclosed in the prior art of Filo. Therefore, claim 11 is believed to be allowable. Dependent claims 12 - 16, which are dependent upon claim 11, are believed to be allowable also.

Claim 17 has now been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Filo. Claim 17 now requires the method of defining the boundaries of the positions that the pointing object can assume in addressing points or regions on display and defining, within the said boundaries, a continuous pointing object surface. Claim 17 also requires segmenting the display surface into at least two regions and segmenting the pointing object surface into at least two regions. These features are not shown or disclosed in Filo et al. Therefore,

claim 17 is believed to be allowable and dependent claims 18 - 21 dependent upon claim 17 are also believed to be allowable.

Claims 22 - 28 have been cancelled. New claims 29 and 30 have been added. Independent claim 29 provides for a method for establishing a mapping between the regions of a display and an image of the same display obtained from a camera requiring the steps similarly required in claim 17. Again, these features are not shown or disclosed in the Filo reference. Therefore, new claims 29 and 30 are believed to be allowable.

This Amendment should place this case in condition for passing to issue. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & BASILE, P.C.



Darlene P. Condra  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37113  
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624  
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107

Dated: April 7, 2004  
DPC/dge